UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,296	07/31/2003	Edward E. Kelley	FIS920030056US1	5054
7590 01/05/2007 Robert S. Nolan Cantor Colburn LLP			EXAMINER NGUYEN, THU V	
55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —			3661	
· SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		01/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/632,296	KELLEY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Thu Nguyen	3661				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDON	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	,					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 Ju	ılv 2003					
·_ ·	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		osecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Disposition of Claims	m parto quayro, 1000 012. 11, 1	00 0.0.270.				
	 Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	with from consideration.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 1-35 are subject to restriction and/or	plaction requirement	·				
o) Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/or 6	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ion No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior						
application from the International Bureau		·				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)	•					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	. 4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	Patent Application				
	5) [

Application/Control Number: 10/632,296

Art Unit: 3661

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:
 - a. Species 1 fig.3 (claims 2-8, 10-19) drawn to transferring information from remote computer to a vehicle navigation system.
 - b. Species 2: fig.7 (claims 20-25) drawn to deploying process software.
 - c. Species 3: fig.6 (claim 26) drawn to integrating process software.
 - d. Species 4: fig.12-13 (claims 27-31) drawn to sharing of process software.
 - e. Species 5: fig.9-11 (claims 32-34) drawn to deploying, accessing executing process software via virtual private network.

The species are independent or distinct because transferring information from a remote computer to a vehicle navigation system does not requires any specific method for deploying process software, integrating process software, sharing the process software, or deploying the process software via virtual private network.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 9 and 35 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 3661

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

2. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 3661

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6967. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

December 29, 2006

THU V. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

legugenter